

Applicants : Kenneth (NMI) Schofield, Mark L. Larson and Keith J. Vadas  
Serial No. : 08/935,336  
Page : 4

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Mannava for the helpful and courteous interview granted to the undersigned and Dr. Niall Lynam, Assignee's representative, on July 21, 1998. At the interview, a videotape was shown which demonstrates the operation of a vehicle rear vision system according to the invention. Also, the teaching of the prior art, particularly the Secor reference, and the manner in which the amended claims distinguish there over was discussed.

In particular, claims 50 and 102 are amended to specify that the display system enhances the displayed image by including an image enhancement which is in the image displayed. Secor does not disclose, teach or suggest an image enhancement which is in the image displayed, namely, the image as outputted to the display device. Accordingly, claims 50 and 102 and the claims dependent thereon are submitted to be distinguishable over the Secor reference. Amended claim 69 specifies that the display system enhances the displayed image by visually highlighting hazards in the area surrounding the vehicle wherein the visually highlighting hazards comprises modifying the displayed images which include the hazards. Claim 85 specifies that the display system visually highlights images of objects too close to the vehicle for safe lane-change maneuver wherein the visually highlighting comprises modifying the displayed images which include objects too close to the vehicle. Secor does not disclose, teach or suggest modifying the displayed image in this manner. Accordingly, claims 69 and 85, and claims dependent thereon, are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Secor.

The remaining references applied to the claims in the Office Action do not make up for that which is missing from Secor. Saneyoshi et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest a display system which displays an image. Hsieh does not disclose, teach or suggest a display system which enhances the displayed image. Nishimura et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest a display system which enhances the displayed image. Jewell et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest a vehicular vision system nor a display system which enhances the displayed image. Shaw et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest a vehicular vision system.

The Office Action indicated that claims 70, 72, 86, 100 and 101 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if the double-patenting rejection is overcome. Claims 70 and 86 are

Applicants : Kenneth (NMI) Schofield, Mark L. Larson and Keith J. Vadas  
Serial No. : 08/935,336  
Page : 5

rewritten in this manner. Claims 72, 100 and 101 are dependent upon one of the rewritten claims as a base claim. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 70, 72, 86, 100 and 101 are allowable.

It is believed that the application is in a condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If Examiner Mannava believes that an additional telephone interview is necessary to address any remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

KENNETH (NMI) SCHOFIELD,  
MARK L. LARSON and  
KEITH J. VADAS

By: Van Dyke, Gardner, Linn & Burkhart, LLP



Frederick S. Burkhart  
Registration No. 29 288  
Post Office Box 888695  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49588-8695  
(616) 975-5500

Dated: July 29, 1998.

FSB:djr  
DON01 P-680